

## REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 1-2 and 24 without prejudice as being drawn to non-elected inventions. Please cancel Claims 4-5 without prejudice. Claims 3 and 6-23 are pending. Claims 3 and 6 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments is found at least in paragraphs 0030 and 0045-0049 of the instant application.

### 102 Rejections

#### Claim 3

The instant Office Actions states that Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beck et al. ("Beck;" U.S. Patent No. 6,381,640). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claim 3 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Beck.

Claim 3 in essence describes a methodology in which information is filtered at both the server and the client. More specifically, information is filtered at the server and used as the basis for selecting files that are sent to the client. The client filters information based on information in the selected files.

Applicants respectfully submit that Beck does not show or suggest these limitations. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Beck does not show or suggest "receiving demographic information at a server; the server comparing the demographic information received to demographic values stored in one or more rules clauses stored in one or more files stored in a package of files; the server selecting files from the package based on

the comparison; and the server sending the selected files to a client, wherein the selected files contain one or more rules executed by the client to determine whether the one or more rules are satisfied by client-based user data” as recited in Claim 3.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Beck does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in Claim 3, and that Claim 3 is considered patentable over Beck.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed.

#### Claims 6-23

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 6-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beck. The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 6-23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Beck.

Applicants respectfully submit that Beck does not show or suggest rules that have the complexity recited in independent Claim 6.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Beck does not show or suggest “a rules-based agent having a plurality of rules clauses for evaluating data, wherein the rules clauses comprise one or more required rules clauses and one or more optional rules clauses; ... and a plurality of actions for providing information to a user based upon the evaluated data, wherein an action is performed provided all of the required rules clauses

and at least one of the optional rules clauses are satisfied” as recited in independent Claim 6. Claims 7-23 are dependent on independent Claim 6 and recite additional limitations.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that Beck does not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claim 6, and that Claim 6 is considered patentable over Beck. Because Claims 7-23 depend from Claim 6 and contain additional limitations, these claims are also considered patentable over Beck.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 6-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed.

#### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 3 and 6-23 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,317,728; 6,298,356; 6,108,686; and 6,199,099.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

*W.A. Zarbis*

William A. Zarbis

Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060

Date: 9/7/05